

**REMARKS / ARGUMENTS**

The above identified patent application has been amended and reconsideration and reexamination are hereby requested.

Claims 1, 6 and 7 are now in the application. Claims 2 – 5 and 8 have been cancelled. Claims 6 and 7 have been amended.

The Examiner has rejected Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being anticipated by Nakao et al.

The Applicants' Claim 1 calls for: ... wherein  $R_r \leq 17\text{nm}$ ,  $R_g \leq 15\text{nm}$  and  $R_b \leq 12\text{nm}$  where  $R_r$ ,  $R_g$  and  $R_b$  are retardations in a black state for red, green and blue lights, respectively.

As such, the Applicants submit that Claim 1 is not anticipated by Nakao et al. under 35 U.S.C. §102(a).

Nakao et al., while providing for a liquid crystal display and its driving method, discloses only the technical feature that retardation in a black state is 70nm. (See paragraphs [0011] to [0013]). Nakao et al. does not disclose the technical feature that  $R_r$ ,  $R_g$  and  $R_b$  are retardations in a black state for red, green and blue light, respectively, and specifically that  $R_r \leq 17\text{ nm}$ ,  $R_g \leq 15\text{ nm}$  and  $R_b \leq 12\text{ nm}$ .

Accordingly, the Applicants submit that Claim 1 is not anticipated by Nakao et al. under 35 U.S.C. §102(a).

The Examiner has also rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103: Claims 2, 3 and 5 as being unpatentable over Nakao et al. in view of Nakamura, Claims 2 and 4 as being unpatentable over Nakao et al. in view of Hsieh et al. and Claim 8 as being unpatentable over Nakao et al. in view of Nakamura, and in further view of Yoshida et al. However, the Examiner has found that Claims 6 and 7 contain allowable subject matter and would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening Claims.

To expedite the allowance of the present application, Applicants have canceled Claims 2 – 5 and 8 and have put Claims 6 and 7 into independent form including all of the limitations of the base Claim 2.

Therefore, in view of the above amendment and remarks it is submitted that the claims are patentably distinct over the prior art and that all the rejections to the claims have been overcome. As such, allowance of the above Application is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

F. CHAU & ASSOCIATES, LLC

Date: SEPT. 2, 2009

By:



Richard J. Paciulan  
Reg. No. 28,248  
Attorney for Applicants

Mailing Address:

**F. CHAU & ASSOCIATES, LLC**

130 Woodbury Road

Woodbury, New York 11797

TEL: (516) 692-8888

FAX: (516) 692-8889